



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING, Heilbronn.

XIII Band, 1889.

I.—George Lyman Kittredge, Supposed Historical Allusions in the Squire's Tale. Kittredge takes issue squarely with Brandl (Am. J. Phil. XII 118-20) in regard to the supposed historical allusions. The criticism is acute and sustained; its results are summarized by Kittredge himself: "It is impossible, then, to accept the theory of Professor Brandl, not merely because it is antecedently improbable, but because it is inconsistent with the language of Chaucer, and because it is inconsistent with itself. Further, this theory rests upon certain errors in matters of fact. And, finally, it involves a supposition contradicting the relation known to have existed between Chaucer and the Mortimer family. For all that appears to the contrary, the world has been right for the last five hundred years in regarding the Squire's Tale as nothing more or less than a romance."

To the article is appended an Additional Note on Chaucer's Dreme, in which Kittredge—and he is apparently right—accuses Brandl of confounding two of the *dramatis personæ* of that poem.

Arthur Napier, Old English Glosses on Isidore's Contra Judaeos.

F. G. Fleay, Annals of the Career of Nathaniel Field. At the close of the article Fleay says: "No complete or correct account has hitherto been given of the known facts of the career of this graceful writer and great actor. Nearly every statement in Collier's life of him that concerns dramatic history is more or less erroneous."

B. Leonhardt, Bonduca. The History of Bonduca, by some ascribed to Beaumont and Fletcher, by others to Fletcher alone, is here considered mainly with reference to its sources, though the play is also analyzed in full. The story of Bonduca, the Boudicca of Tacitus, the Boadicea of Glover, Cowper, and Tennyson, is related by Tacitus and Dio Cassius. According to these authorities, she was queen of the Iceni, a British tribe, and, after making head for a time against Roman oppression, died in A. D. 61. The accounts of the ancients were transcribed by the chronicler Holinshed, and are also reproduced by Petruccio Ubaldino, whose book, entitled, *Le Vite delle Donne Illustri del Regno d'Inghilterra e del Regno di Scotia*, etc., was published at London in 1591. In the drama the story of Caractacus, separately related by Tacitus and Dio Cassius, is interwoven with that of Bonduca, on the strength of a doubtful identification by Hector Boece, according to which Caractacus was the brother-in-law of Bonduca. A play which preceded that of Bonduca, and to which the latter may have been indebted, is that entitled *The Valiant Welshman*, or the *True Chronicle History of the Life and Valiant Deedes of*

Caradoc the Great. The similarity resides in the characterization of the British hero, and in that of a subordinate personage, named Gald in *The Valiant Welshman*, and Hengo in *Bonduca*. Leonhardt's results are to the effect that "Beaumont and Fletcher derived the historic material of the drama from the chronicle of Holinshed, and employed *The Valiant Welshman* and *Antony and Cleopatra* for the further development and characterization of certain individuals."

F. Weinthaler, *Something from Educational Experience, a Contribution to the Question of Instruction in Modern Languages*.

The Book Notices include reviews of William Vollhardt's *Influence of Latin Theological Literature on some Minor Productions of the English Transition Period*, Heinrich Krautwald's *Layamon's Brut compared with Wace's Roman de Brut in Relation to the Portrayal of English Culture*, Thomas R. Price's *The Construction and Types of Shakespeare's Verse as seen in the Othello*, and Landmann's *The Times*, No. 31,725, edited as a Reading Book for Advanced Pupils. The review of Krautwald's dissertation, by Klinghardt, contains some interesting suggestions regarding subjects for the doctoral thesis. Thus he says: "The usual phonetic (for the most part rather graphic) and syntactical essays are commonly of little furtherance to either the science or the author; the latter is much more likely to derive fruitful stimulus from an aesthetico-literary investigation. . . . But especially suited to candidates for the doctor's degree appears to me the task of painting, by means of detailed researches, the actual (*realen*) background of the chief literary works in as glowing colors and with as much vividness as possible."

In the *Miscellanea* there is printed a Fragment of an Old English Legend, from the celebrated MS Cotton Vitellius A XV, by G. Herzfeld, and Four New Alexander Fragments, by Karl D. Bülbring.

II.—Max Kupferschmidt, *The Relations among the Manuscripts of the Winchester Annals*. The seven MSS of the O. E. Chronicle, denoted by the first seven letters of the alphabet, are described by Petrie in the first volume of the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, and by Thorpe and Earle in their editions of the Chronicle. Kupferschmidt's conclusions, after constructing a genealogical diagram of the MSS, are these:

- "1. A is not the original of the Winchester Annals.
2. A and G have each independently derived their contents from a common source *a*, since lost.
3. B and C have in like manner derived their material from a common original *γ*, since lost.
4. D and E have similarly drawn from a lost original *δ*.
5. The lost sources *γ* and *δ* did not come directly from the ultimate original O, but through an intermediate text *o*, in which the ultimate original had undergone some changes."

To the foregoing may be added that O, the ultimate original, is regarded as the direct source of *x* and *o*; A and G being at a second remove from the original, and the other MSS, except F, at a third remove. F is disregarded, as being a later and abridged compilation.

Leon Kellner, *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes*, a Romantic Drama of the Sixteenth Century. Dyce ascribed the piece to Peele, on the strength of "a MS note in a very old hand." He is supported, according to Kellner, by Ward, Minto and Lämmerhirt, but opposed by Ulrici, Klein, Symonds and Bullen. Kellner examines the external indications of language, prosody and alliteration, and the internal of dramatic technic—plot and characterization—and style. Peele cannot have written *Clyomon and Clamydes* in sober earnest, but it may have been intended as a parody of the chivalrous drama, and in that case Kellner would have less hesitation in attributing it to him.

J. F. Jameson, *Historical Writing in the United States since 1861*. The last lecture in the series of four delivered at Baltimore in 1887 (see *Am. J. Phil.* XII 118). Extracts may give an idea of the author's acumen and breadth: "The tendencies of most of our numerous local historical societies form a counter-current, or rather let me say an eddy, in which ships of ancient timber float placidly round and round in the same little circle, quite unaffected by any general currents whatever. Dominated exclusively by their oldest and most obscurant members, inaccessible to suggestion, and wedded to tradition, the thought of touching anything that occurred since the Revolution, that is, of having anything to do with the most important part of our history, would be to most of them a profound shock. The suggestion to them that American historical work *needs* a change of base, a thorough reorganization, a direction toward a new range of subjects, would almost subject one to the suspicion of atheism." On the other hand, we have cautions like these: "I think it useful, in spite of present tendency, to point out the limitations which must to some extent beset all coöperative or monographic histories alike. Stretched on the Procrustean bed of uniform requirements in respect to extensiveness and general method of treatment, the authors can present only those things which they have in common—abundant and correct information, and acute historical criticism. Many of the finer qualities of the individual are likely to evaporate in the process; much of what is most valuable in individual views and conceptions of history will find no place for itself." And again: "Already increasing numbers of special students of history are frequenting those universities which afford graduate instruction. I do not wish to imitate the Ephesians in the Acts, and shout for about the space of two hours or even for a small fraction of the allotted fifty minutes, Great is Johns Hopkins of the Baltimoreans!, but the fact remains that here are annually gathered together a larger number of graduate students of history than anywhere else in the country."

The longest and most important article in the *Book Notices* is a review of ten Brink's *Beowulf* by Hermann Möller. It is scarcely too much to say that the review should be read by every student of the book on which it is based. In a notice of Schmeding's *The Residence of Modern Philologists and the Study of Modern Languages Abroad*, a quotation from the book is given: "We allow to antiquity its historical rights; but our real fountain of life and our real bread of life we look for in our own sphere. Yes, we feel wherein we have the superiority over our colleagues, the ancient philologists, in the whole field of our studies and labors being traversed and irrigated by the powerful and life-giving stream of the present."

III.—Julius Zupitza, *The Romance of Athelston*. The text is printed from MS 175 of Caius College, Cambridge, with the variants of the printed editions by Hartshorne and Wright. The poem consists of 812 lines, occupying nearly twelve pages. This is followed by explanatory notes, occupying a little over seventy-one pages. Seldom, if ever, has a greater or more valuable mass of comment for the illustration of Middle English authors been compressed into so small a space. Every student of Middle English poetry will derive instruction from an acquaintance with these pages.

P. Holzhausen, *Dryden's Heroic Drama*. After an introduction, in which the more recent Dryden literature in Germany is chronicled, the paper is occupied with the author's First or Historical Part, which he entitles Definition of the Heroic Drama, Origin and Evolution of the Heroic Drama in England, and particularly of John Dryden's Heroic Plays.

G. Wendt, *The English House of Commons*.

The Book Notices have reviews of the fifth edition of Heyne's *Beowulf*, in which E. Koepfel finds many errors; of Gregor Sarrazin's *Beowulf Studies*, which the same reviewer condemns; of the third edition of Zupitza's *Elene*, of Kölbing's *Ipomedon in Three English Forms*, and of Sweet's *History of English Sounds*. In the latter, written by F. Kluge, allusion is made to Sweet's prefatory grumble about the 'inevitable German,' upon which Kluge remarks: "We Germans are far from considering this as an indictment of ourselves, but regard it rather as an indictment of English scholarship. That the latter concedes no place and grants no adequate recognition to the history of the national language and literature is indeed shameful—but not for us."

In the *Miscellanea*, Max Kaluza, who has done so much for the *Romaunt of the Rose*, makes three emendations of passages in that poem.

XIV Band, 1890.

I.—L. Kellner, *On the Textual Criticism of Chaucer's Boethius*. In Morris' edition of Chaucer's *Boece* for the Chaucer Society, he had based his text on Add. MS 10,340 of the British Museum and MS II 3, 21 of Cambridge University Library. Kellner is convinced that the Caxton print of *Boece* is from an independent MS, more closely akin to the second above mentioned than to the first. He gives a long list of divergencies in Caxton from the other two MSS, and recommends a new edition of the *Boece*, using the Salisbury MS and the Caxton print, as well as the two which underlie the Morris text.

E. H. Oliphant, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*. Fleay and Boyle, besides a Mr. Macaulay, have of late been trying to discriminate between the work of Beaumont and that of Fletcher. These two students have employed somewhat different tests. The present writer employs still others, coming to independent conclusions before consulting his predecessors, and then checking and correcting his results by theirs. After characterizing Fletcher, Beaumont and Massinger, and their writing, Oliphant proceeds to an examination of the following plays: *The Woman-Hater*, *Love's Cure*, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, *Cupid's Revenge*, *The Coxcomb*, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, *Philaster*, *A King and No King*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, *The Captain*, *The Masque of the Inner Temple*.

H. Klinghardt, *The Genetic Explanation of the Expressional Forms (Ausdrucksformen) of Language in Teaching*. By 'expressional forms' the author understands the typical combination of two or more words. Of these he makes two classes: (a) general, constructional, or syntactical; and (b) individual or phraseological. The former head includes constructions which are amenable to the ordinary laws of grammar, the latter comprises what are commonly understood by 'idiomatic phrases.' Klinghardt's recommendation is that the latter should not be learned *en bloc*, as it were, in the acquisition of a foreign language, and conceived of merely as the equivalent of certain other phrases, idiomatic or otherwise, in the native tongue, but that, so far as practicable, the force of the various elements which compose the phrase shall be ascertained, and the idiom built up in the mind so as to be intelligible in all its parts as well as in its entirety. The same principle should also be observed, *mutatis mutandis*, in teaching the constructions which belong under the first head.

In the Book Notices, Lauchert's *Geschichte des Physiologus* is criticised by M. F. Mann, on the ground that it contains little that is new, that its author does not give due credit to his predecessors, that he has not consulted all the existing literature, that his knowledge of the manuscripts is superficial, that his book lacks a bibliography—in fine, that, with some merits, it does not deserve to rank as standard. To the foregoing Lauchert appends a note confessing some of his omissions. Emil Koeppel reviews Flügel's *Sidney's Astrophel and Stella and Defence of Poesie*, and, with comparatively slight reservations, praises it. Among other works noticed are Breymann and Wagner's edition of Marlowe, Sommer's *First Attempt at English Pastoral Poetry*, and Uhlemann's *The Author of the Commentary on Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar*.

II.—M. Kaluza, *Minor Publications from Middle English Manuscripts*.
I. *The Eremyte and the Outlawe*. This is a ballad of 387 lines, published from Add. MS 22,577 of the British Museum, with introduction and notes. The original MS was in possession of William Fillingham, but has since disappeared. This poem was copied out by Fillingham, who in 1806 presented it to Philip Bliss, then of St. John's College, Oxford, and afterwards Principal of St. Mary's Hall. Kaluza gives an abstract of the contents, decides that the dialect is Midland, and dates it approximately in the first half of the fifteenth century. The poem is written in tail-rime strophes of twelve lines each, with the rime-arrangement *aab ccb ddb eeb*. Alliterative formulas are frequent; formulas consisting of synonyms or antonyms connected by a conjunction are less common; such, for example, as *dep and wyde, thys myrthe and thys solempruite*.

F. Lauchert, *The Influence of the Physiologus upon Euphuism*. Euphuism, as is well known, employed a vast number of similes, largely drawn from an imaginary natural history. Its founder, Guevara, has but few such similes in his works, but in Lyly they already abound. Pliny has been usually credited with the authorship of the statements on which these comparisons rest. Lauchert, admitting that this may in a measure be the correct view, asks whence the impulse came to compare the acts or qualities of human beings with those of animals, and finds an answer in the influence exerted by the *Physiologus*

throughout the Middle Ages and into the Elizabethan period. Thus Chaucer has (*Nonne Prestes Tale*, 448-51):

"And Chauntecleer so free
Song merier than the mermayde in the see ;
For Physiologus seith sikerly,
How that they singen wel and merily."

Referring to the works of Lyly, Greene, Nash, Lodge and Gosson, the author then shows how they employ the traditional lore concerning the pelican, eagle, phoenix, viper (but this notion *does* come from Pliny; see my edition of Sidney's *Defense of Poesy*, 2. 26, note), basilisk, panther, unicorn, hyena, turtle-dove, stag, salamander, diamond or adamant, elephant, ichneumon, crocodile, ostrich and chameleon. But the euphuists did not confine themselves to extracting fabulous zoology from the *Physiologi*, but added similar matter from other sources, if not from their own invention. Illustrations are drawn, for example, from supposed facts concerning the lion, tigress, sow, tortoise, toad, gems like the aetites or draconites, the 'stone of Sicilia,' the 'fire stone of Liguria,' the 'pyrite stone,' and, to end this list, the 'roots of Anchusa. Shakespeare is also in some sense a euphuist, as Lauchert shows, using the similes of the pelican, eagle, phoenix, viper, unicorn, turtle-dove, adder, salamander, crocodile and chameleon.

W. Swoboda, *The Toussaint-Langenscheidt Method*. This is a successful mode of teaching modern languages by correspondence, of which we have heard much in America under other names. Swoboda's judgment is expressed in a single paragraph near the close of his article, which is here reproduced :

"If we are now to sum up the result and classify the Toussaint-Langenscheidt method, we must call it a methodical eclecticism, based, it is true, on the analytical-direct method of Hamilton and Jacotot, but strongly influenced by Robertson's bent toward the reflective method, and by the reflective method itself as applied by the Neohumanism of the 19th century first to the classical and then to the modern languages. The points of contact with the direct method of the present time, so far as they need to be considered, are the employment of coherent reading matter from the very outset, and the resulting drill with the help of questions asked in English [or whatever foreign language is to be learned]. This coincidence can, however, by no means be regarded as a proof that the direct method is a mere offshoot of the Toussaint-Langenscheidt, since there is a decided difference in aim and in the course pursued. With reference to what they possess in common, they should rather be considered as drawing independently from older sources. It may with more justice be assumed that the correspondence method, so far, in particular, as relates to the utilization of phonetics for purposes of language teaching, has profited by the direct method."

Those who are interested in the methodology of Modern Language teaching should consult the whole of Swoboda's paper.

The Book Notices have a review by A. Schröer of his own edition of the *Rule of St. Benet* and that by Logeman; by Schröer, of König's *Der Vers in Shakespeare's Dramen*; by Max Koch, of Raymond's *Poetry as a Representative Art*, and of a number of other books and dissertations by various hands.

The Miscellanea contains obituary notices of Delius and of Herrig, a wordy war between Lauchert and his reviewer, and an account by R. Ackermann of the Shelley Society and its publications.

III.—Julius Zupitza, *The Romance of Athelston*. III. *Epilegomena*. Zupitza concludes his edition of this romance with the same thoroughness already displayed. The poem is contained in but one MS, so far as is known, No. 175 of Caius College. There are 156 pages of double columns. The scribe is of the second half of the 14th century. Zupitza gives a summary of the contents of the MS, and also of the poem. The romance has almost nothing in common with authentic history. Alliteration is abundant, as Zupitza's table shows. Most of the strophes are of the kind known as twelve-line tail-rime strophes (59 out of 75), and the rime-scheme is generally *aab ccb ddb eeb*. The rime is almost always pure, so far as the vowels are concerned, but words in *m* sometimes rime with those in *n*, and other consonantal irregularities are found. The investigation of the dialect, first by Wilda (*Ueber die örtliche Verbreitung der zwölfzeiligen Schweifreimstrophe in England*), and afterwards by Zupitza, leads the former to the conclusion that it is Northern, while the latter pronounces it North Midland. The date may be ca. 1350. The paper closes with an index to the notes, occupying six pages of double columns.

Rudolf Fischer, *The Question Concerning the Authorship of Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamides*. The author undertakes an independent investigation, which leads him to a result opposed to Kellner's (*Engl. Stud.* 13, 187 ff.). He therefore vindicates Peele's authorship of the drama by the application of a variety of tests.

Horatio S. White, *Recent American Historical Publications*. White notices Tuttle's *History of Prussia* and Washburne's *Recollections of a Minister to France*.

The Book Notices are crowded out by the Miscellanea. The latter contains a long article by Emil Koeppl on the Textual Criticism of *Ipomedon*, and notes on *Ipomedon A, B and C* by George Lyman Kittredge. F. Holthausen has Contributions to the Exegesis and Textual Criticism of Old and Middle English Monuments, the latter including the Blickling Homilies, the first series of Old English Homilies, ed. Morris, and the Legends of Mary from the Lambeth MS, ed. Horstmann. Karl Breul contributes two Middle English Christmas Carols. Robert Boyle treats of *All's Well that Ends Well* and *Love's Labor's Won*. Sarrazin encounters Emil Koeppl's criticism in *Englische Studien*, Vol. XIII, with a rejoinder, and Koeppl replies. There is a second instalment of the study on Schaible's *History of the Germans in England* (see *Am. J. Phil.* XI 378), besides a number of minor articles.

ALBERT S. COOK.

FLECKEISEN'S JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. Jahrgang 1890. Fascicles 7-12.

Fascicle 7.

46. Ueber datierung und veranlassung von Pindars zweiter Pythischer ode : A. B. Drachmann, Kopenhagen. The poem is connected with the Olympian chariot-races of Ol. 78. The author's purpose is to heal the breach at that time existing between the poet and Hieron.

47. Bemerkungen zu Aristophanes: W. Pökel, Prenzlau. This is a continuation of similar notes published by P. in 1888 (Am. J. Phil. XXXVIII 250). The plays concerned in these notes are the Acharnians, Birds, Thesmophoriazusae. The great merit of the Ravenna MS, which is at the basis of many of these notes, is the excellence and correctness of accent.

48. Zu Xenophon: Critical notes made by O. May, Neisze, on Xenophon's Hell. III 2, 28 (read *περικλείσθη* for *περιπλήσθη*), on III 4, 5 (read *ἐλπεις γ' ἔστιν* for *ἀλλ' ἐξέστιν*), and on Cyr. II 1, 30 (transpose *ὥστε ἰκανήν*).

49. Zu Kleomedes ΚΥΚΛΙΚΗ ΘΕΩΡΙΑ ΜΕΤΕΩΡΩΝ: M. Lüdecke, Bremen. A very careful judgment of the relative value of the Cod. Lips. 361 of the library of the University at Leipsic.

50. Kleine beobachtungen zum lateinischen sprachgebrauch: M. C. P. Schmidt, Berlin. I. *Cernere* mit accusativus cum infinitivo; II. *Reperire* mit accusativus cum infinitivo. The citations are excellent, although no particular conclusions are reached.

51. Zu Ennius und Terentius: A. Fleckeisen, Dresden. A critical note on the Eunuchus of Terence, v. 590; for *sonitu concutit* Bentley conjectured *nutu concutit*. F. proposes *suo nutu concutit*. The line usually reads: *qui tēpla caeli summa sonitu concutit*.

52. Zu Vergilius: F. Weck, Metz. On Aen. II 57 ff. A critical study of the sense of the text from the line at which Sinon appears, through line 73.

(16). Frühlings Anfang: G. F. Unger, Würtzburg. This is the conclusion of Unger's work which has appeared on this subject in two of the first six fascicles of this volume, and been noted in vol. XII of the Am. J. Philol., p. 249. This is an exhaustive collection of all the material which bears upon the Romans. The popular conception among them was that spring began at the equinox.

53. Zu Timaios: H. Kothe, Breslau. For *παρ' Ἀσσυρίων* read *παρὰ Τυρίων*, in the preface to the sixth book (Polyb. XII 28 a, 3 H).

Fascicles 8 and 9.

54. Die letzten aufführungen und das ende des alten Kratinos: H. Müller-Strübing, London. The traditional account of the death of Kratinos is at best unreliable; he was still living at the time of the presentation of the 'Peace' of Aristophanes; his *ᾠραι* was brought out at the Lenaea 421; his last piece is the *Σερίφοι*, 410 B. C. The article covers over thirty pages; some part of it was written ten years ago, though presented now with some corrections and additions.

55. Zu Aristonikos: A. Ludwich, Königsberg. Aristarchus pronounced *ἦρωι* as a dissyllable.

56. Dieuchidas und Dikaiarchos: H. Düntzer, Köln. This is a vigorous assault upon Wilamowitz, who holds the view that Dieuchidas is the oldest witness to the interest of Pisistratus in Homeric research.

57. Heinrich Schliemann und Ernst Böttcher: P. Habel, Breslau. This is an interesting statement of the differences, and their causes, between these

two archaeologists. It comes from the side of a warm and enthusiastic believer in Schliemann.

58. Ad Sophoclis *Aiacem*: R. Peppmueller, Stralsund. In v. 477 for *οὐδενὸς λόγον βροτῶν* read *οὐδ' ἐνδὸς λόγου βροτῶν*.

(12). Zur katastrophe in Sophocles *Antigone*. This article is in reply to and directed against the theory of F. Seiler stated on p. 104 ff. of this year's (1890) volume, and noted in vol. XII of the *Am. J. Philol.*, p. 249. It is by B. Nake, Berlin.

(43). Zu den Homerscholien: C. de Boor, Bonn. On Schol. A to Σ 486.

59. Ad Xenophontis *Hieronem*: C. Häberlin, Halle. A critical note on 10, 4, proposing <πάντες> *εἰδείμεν* for *εἰδείεν*.

(40). Zu Nonnos *Dionysiaka*: Otto Crusius, Tübingen. Critical notes on XLIII 212 and XLIII 196 ff.

60. Die kalenderdaten in Catos schrift *de agri cultura*: F. Olck, Königsberg. This paper is an attempt at a thorough investigation as to how far the calendar dates in the *de agri cultura* may be valuable in Roman chronology.

61. Ad *Caesaris commentarios*: J. S. Van Veen, Assen. Critical notes on *de bello civili*.

62. Zu Caesars zweitem zuge nach Britannien: K. Petsch, Kiel. This article comes as a defense of Caesar's narrative, in reply to Lange, in the *Jbchr.*, 1889, p. 187 ff. See *Am. J. Philol.*, vol. XI, p. 115.

63. Zu *Caesar de bello civili*: A. E. Schoene, Blasewitz. Critical notes on the second book.

64. Studien zur geschichte Diocletians und Constantins. III. Die entstehungszeit der *historia augusta*: O. Seeck, Greifswald. Seeck agrees in the main with Dessau and Klebs, who put the date of the *Hist. Aug.* in the fifth century.

65. Zu *Plautus Truculentus*. A critical note by E. Redslob, Weimar.

Fascicle 10.

66. Zur composition der Hesiodischen Werke und Tage: R. Peppmüller, Stralsund. The question of the origin of the 'Works and Days' has been answered by A. Kirchhoff ('Hesiodos Mahnlieder an Perses,' Berlin, 1889) by the 'kleinlieder-theorie.' Peppmüller aims to demonstrate that the separate portions or stanzas are the organic parts of one distinct composition.

67. Zur Pindarischen Theologie: A. Rieder, Gumbinnen. A very useful collection of the material for a study of the different deities, the study of Pindar's deviations from Homer in his conception of life after death, of *μοῖρα*, and the worship of heroes.

68. ΩΡΑ = Stunde bei Pytheas: G. Biefinger, Stuttgart. A reply to the objections made by M. C. P. Schmidt against this theory. Schmidt's objections are found in the *Jbhr.* 1889, p. 826 ff.; *A. J. P.*, No. 44, p. 526.

69. ΑΙΣΧΙΝΗΣ Ο ΣΕΛΛΑΟΥ: R. Meister, Leipzig. Meister recognizes in this Aeschines, so frequently satirized by Aristophanes, the Socratic philosopher,

son of Lysanias. 'Ο Σελλοῦ has the same sense as the adjectival ὁ Σελλιος, one who has the nature of the σελλός.

(47). Zu Aristophanes: F. Blank, Wien. Critical note on the Knights.

70. Die handschriften der hymnen des Mesomedes: C. von Jan, Strassburg. Of Bellermann's three classes the second must be abandoned. The archetypus of the MSS of the second class is the Ven. VI 2.

71. Die römischen schaltjahre seit 190 vor Christ. A demonstration that of the years 190-165 before Christ the even years were the leap years, and the odd the common years. The argument is by W. Soltau, of Zabern, perhaps the best qualified man to speak with authority on this subject.

72. De grammaticorum principe: O. Immisch, Leipzig. Antidorus (not Antodorus) of Cumae was the first who named himself γραμματικός, in the title of his λήξις.

73. Zum heerwesen der Römer: P. O. Schjött, Christiania. A discussion of Livy, VIII, §8, on the number of men in a legion. 15 maniples in the *hastati*, with two centurions and one *vexillarius* = 945 men; with the same in the *principes* = 1890. 15 maniples of *subsignani* , each 186 men, = 2790; this + 1890 = 4680 in the legion. The remaining 320 necessary to make up the 5000 mentioned in the chapter may have been in the general's staff, the *fabri* and the musicians.

74. Zu Sallustius: R. Lehmann, Neustettin. Critical notes on I, Cato, 20, §8, and II, Cato, 21, §1.

75. Zu Livius: K. Niemeyer, Kiel. Critical notes on II 65, 4 f.; III 41, 8; III 35, 3; V 11, 2; VII 30, 11; VII 39, 10; VII 40, 9; X 9, 6; XXXII 32, 6; and XXX 13, 1-12.

76. Zu Januarius Nepotianus: C. F. W. Müller, Breslau. A demonstration in a number of passages of Nepotianus, that his latinity has been overestimated by new critics, while that of the manuscripts has been underestimated.

77. Zu [Apulejus] Asclepius: J. Segebode, Oldenburg. On c. 21: insert < *Venerem* > (= semen) after *rapiat* as object.

Fascicle 11.

78. Die stadt Athen im altertum, von Curt Wachsmuth; zweiter band, erste abtheilung: Teubner, 1890. xvi + 527 pp., 8vo. Review by W. Judeich, Marburg. Sixteen years have passed since the appearance of the first volume, years so full of results that this new volume, which rests upon them, seems hardly to be a companion to the first. Though the work of Köhler, Lolling, von Wilamowitz, Milchhöfer, Curtius and others lies at hand for everybody, yet the work of Wachsmuth is not superfluous. It is a careful, painstaking production. The first division discusses 'die hafenstadt,' pp. 4-176; the second, 'die hafenstrasse,' pp. 177-96; the third, 'stadtmauern und stadthore,' pp. 197-230; the fourth, 'städtische demen und quartiere,' pp. 231-78; the fifth, 'die strassen der stadt,' pp. 279-303; the sixth, 'die agora,' pp. 305-527.

79. ΘΕΩΝ ΕΝ Γ' ΟΥΝΑΣΙ ΚΕΙΤΑΙ: F. Weck, Metz. The common reading γοίνασι is untenable. For this W. proposes γ' ούνασι, and translates: "es kann so und so, es kann anders kommen, als nach menschlicher berechnung erwartet wird." ἐπιόνιος is also connected with ὄναρ, = der traumreiche, traumbringer. The function of Hermes as dream-god is signified in his epithet ἀκάκητα, = vorspiegler, gaukler (cf. ἀκκῶ, ἀκκίζομαι).

(5). Zur Odyssee: A. Scotland, Strasburg. Read α 28 thus: ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ὀδύρετο πυκνὰ πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε. Cut out vv. 37-42, and in 43 read: οὐκ ὀπίδα φρονέων for πεῖθ' ἀγαθὰ φρονέων.

80. E und ex vor consonanten in den fragmenten der ältern römischen poesie: F. Harder, Berlin.

(32). Ne . . . quidem: P. Meyer and M. C. P. Schmidt. Meyer opposes the view set up by Schmidt, p. 299 of this volume, by a different interpretation of the six test-passages given by Schmidt. The latter offers additional passages. See Am. J. Philol. XII 251.

81. Zu Horatius: F. van Hoff. This is à propos of what van Hoff has already published on the third epode in the Treves gymnasial programme for 1887. Also an exegetical note by Th. Plüss on Od. II 20.

82. Zu Ausonius: M. Mertens, Köln. A study in the dates of the works of Ausonius.

83. Zu Julius Valerius: D. Volkmann. A series of critical notes.

(52). Zu Vergilius: Edward Goebel, Fulda. Critical note on Aen. I 194 ff.

Fascicle 12.

84. ΘΟΥΚΥΔΙΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΗ: W. G. Rutherford, London. Reviewed by K. Hude, Copenhagen. Hude finds fault with the reckless rejection of some passages and the too ready conjectures in other places. It is far too evident that not enough discernment and industry are exercised by Rutherford in the establishment of his text.

85. Zu den Orphischen Theogonien: F. Susemihl, Greifswald. A discussion of several points as to the Orphic Theogony, in which Gruppe, who usually agrees with Susemihl, differs from him. Interesting in this connection are O. Kern's 'De Orphei Epimenidis Pherecydis theogoniis quæss. critt.' (Berlin, 1888) and Susemihl's 'De theogoniae Orphicae forma antiquissima.'

86. Zu Nikandros: E. Goebel, Fulda. Critical notes.

87. Zu Kallimachos. Critical notes on the hymns of Kallimachos by E. Dittrich, Leipzig.

88. Beiträge zu Polybios: Th. Büttner-Wobst, Dresden. III. A continuation from 1884, pp. 111-22, and 1889, pp. 671-92. The author of this article points out that Polybios avoids any hiatus with ἦ (or, than). A number of passages are also critically handled.

(12). Die katastrophe in Sophokles Antigone. A continuation and conclusion of the discussion opened by F. Seiler in the Jahrbücher, 1890, p. 104 ff.,

and continued by B. Nake, p. 569 ff. The question is: According to the purpose of Sophocles, is the inverted order in Kreon's acts of repentance [the visit to Polyneikes and then to Antigone] of importance or not for the final entrance of the catastrophe? Both disputants substantially agree that it is not.

(61). Zu Caesar De bello Gallico: A. Kunze, Planen im Vogtland. On *despectus* (*deiectus*?) in II 29, 3.

50. Kleine beobachtungen zum lat. sprachgebrauch: M. C. P. Schmidt, Berlin (to be continued). This is a continuation from pp. 463-66 of this volume. 3, 4, 5 treat of *invenire*, *experire*, *perspicere*, with the infin. and subj. accus.; 6, *praestare* with the infin. and subj. accus., and with *ut* or *ne*; 7-8, *praescribere* and *urgere* with *ut*; 9, *pugnare* with *ut* or *ne*; 10, *indicare* with the infin. and subj. accus.

WILLIAM E. WATERS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. XII.

No. I.

1. Pp. 1-12. J. B. Mispoulet discusses the process at law that plays so important a part in Hor. Sermon. I 9. Bolanus was the defendant, and he himself had given the *vadimonium*. In case of *vadimonium desertum*, the plaintiff could either take temporary possession of the property of the defendant, or apply the *in ius vocatio*. The latter course was adopted in this instance. Bolanus had neglected his *vadimonium* to remain with Horace. The hour for the court to take recess had arrived, and then came the *in ius vocatio*. These points are well established, not merely conjectured.

2. P. 12. E. Rabiet shows that in Plin. Nat. Hist. III 4, 34 we should read *Dexivatum*.

3. Pp. 13-18. Émile Chatelain gives the history, the rediscovery and a description of a long-lost MS of Horace, formerly kept at Autun, now No. 10,310 of the National Library of Paris.

4. Pp. 19-25. A. Baudouin examines and classifies five MSS of Cic. De Inventione, which form two families distinct from the two represented by P, H, and S, which are the only MSS as yet used to any considerable extent.

5. Pp. 26-29. George Doncieux critically discusses and emends [Tibul.] IV 8 and 9, poems of Sulpicia.

6. P. 29. In Arist. Phys. II 2, 194 b 13, Ruelle proposes $\chi\rho\nu\sigma\delta\varsigma < \chi\rho\nu\sigma\acute{o}\nu >$ for $\eta\lambda\omega\varsigma$.

7. Pp. 30-37. Louis Duvau emends Lucr. De Rer. Nat. IV 792 ff., so as to read: Quia tempore in uno, | cum sentimus idem, cum vox emittitur una, | tempora multa latent, etc. He then shows that Lachmann erred in supposing that the original of the *Oblongus* was written in capitals.

8. Pp. 38-42. In Cic. Verr. II 4, 90 Paul Lejay proposes *religione tecti te vinctum adstrictumque*, and discusses the character of the MS from which R was copied.

9. P. 42. In Ter. Heaut. 530-32 L. Havet proposes: CHREMES: Hominem pistrino dignum. SYRUS: Quem istunc? CHREMES: Servulum | dico adulescentis. SYRUS: Syre, tibi timui male. | CHREMES: Qui passus est id fieri? SYRUS: Quid faceret?

10. Pp. 43-59. The construction of *POTIUS QUAM*, by O. Riemann. After remarking on the inadequate treatment of this subject in all grammars, including his own, Riemann enumerates and classifies all the examples known to him, regretting that the list is incomplete. (a) *Potius quam* with the subjunctive is employed when a person placed between two alternatives chooses one with the object of avoiding the other; as *perpessus est omnia potius quam conscios . . . indicaret*. (b) *Potius quam* with the dependent verb in the mood of the leading verb to indicate that the latter is more exact or in some way truer than the former; as *fecerat potius cur suspectus esset Romanis quam satis statuerat utram foveret partem*. But the distinction between these formulae is not invariably observed, and special cases arise.

I. 1. When the leading verb is a form of *sum* with *-ndus*, the two constructions would naturally be as in these examples: (a) *Moriendum nobis est potius quam hoc patiamur*. (b) *Vivendum nobis est potius quam moriendum*. But in fact before Livy construction (b) alone is used in both senses; as Cic. Verr. II 1, 81, ut Lampsaceni moriendum sibi potius quam *perpetiendum* putarent. Id. P. Dom., §100, demigrandum potius aliquo est quam *habitandum* in ea urbe, etc. In these and some other examples in Cicero, the sense is evidently that of construction (a). But cf. Liv. VII 40, 14, vel iniquis standum est potius quam impias inter nos *conseramus* manus. Of course, construction (b) in its proper sense is common, as Cic. Off. I 112, Catoni . . . moriendum potius quam tyranni vultus *aspiciendus* fuit.

2. Also when the leading verb is some form of *-urus sum*, Cicero once (Ad Fam. II 16, 3) and Caesar once (De Bel. Civ. III 49, 2), use construction (b) in the sense of (a). No other examples of either construction have been found in these authors. Construction (a), on the other hand, is found in Terence, Sallust, Cornelius Nepos, Livy, Tacitus (usually, of course, *-urum (esse)* potius quam with subjunc. pres. or imperf.; but *esse* is always omitted, while *fuisse* occurs Liv. IV 2, 9).

II. 1. When the leading verb is in the indicative (not periphrastic), construction (a) exhibits the pres. or impf. subjunc. after *potius quam*, according to the time of the leading verb, and construction (b) exhibits the indic. after *potius quam*; but in Cic. P. Dom. 56 (cur me flentes potius persecuti sunt quam aut increpantes *retinuerunt* aut irati *reliquerunt*?) and in Plaut. Cist. 358 (perdam operam potius quam *carebo* filiam) the sense seems to call for construction (a).

2. When the leading verb is imperative, all the examples exhibit construction (a) in both form and sense, the verb being in the pres. subjunc.

3. When *potius quam* is attached to a *pres.* or *imperf.* subjunc., the two constructions become identical in form, the verb introduced by *quam* being in the pres. or imperf. subjunc.

4. When, however, *potius quam* is attached to a *perf.* or a *pluperf.* subjunc., the two constructions are distinguished by their form, (a) having the *imperf.* subjunc., (b) the *perf.* or *pluperf.* (same mood and tense as its leading verb).

But in Cic. Cat. II 3 (si quis est . . . qui . . . me vehementer accuset quod tam capitale hostem non comprehenderim potius quam *emiserim*), construction (b) seems to be used in the sense of (a): cur non comprehendit potius quam emisit?

III. 1. If the leading verb (indic.) has been converted into an *infin.* by indirect discourse, construction (a) probably retains the subjunc. unchanged after *potius quam*. Cf. Liv. II 15, 2. But as the *fut. indic.* assumes the form -*urum esse*, the peculiarity already mentioned (I 2) reappears. Construction (b) (*infin.* for *indic.*) seems to be used in the sense of (a) in Cic. P. Dei. 23, non quaero quam veri simile sit . . ., qui dicto audientes in tanta re non fuissent, eos vinctos potius quam *necatos* (direct, "cur eos vinxit potius quam *necaret*?""). So in Cic. Ad Att. II 20, 2 (addit . . . se prius occisum iri ab eo quam me *violatum iri*, the only example of a future *pass.* in indirect discourse) construction (b) seems to have the sense of (a).

2. When *potius quam* is attached to an infinitive not in indirect discourse, the following formulae arise: Construction (a), "Abire decet potius quam haec *patiari*." "Expedi tibi abire potius quam haec *patiari*." "Abire cupimus potius quam haec *patiamur*." Construction (b), "Abire decet potius quam *manere*." "Abire expedit potius quam *manere*." "Abire cupimus potius quam *manere*." But sometimes construction (b) is used in the sense of (a). Cf. Cic. Verr. II 3, 99; De Fin. 4, 20, etc., where (a) is regularly employed. Cic. Verr. II 3, 191; Liv. VII 21, 1, etc., where (b) has the sense of (a). Some doubtful examples occur.

3. With *malo* (*praestat, satius est*) . . . *quam*, two infinitives are naturally used. When *potius* is pleonastically added to *malo*, etc., the construction seems regularly to remain the same; but sometimes *quam* is followed by the *subjunc.*, as Plaut. Capt. 681 f.; Ter. Hec. 532 ff. The *subjunc.* is sometimes used even when this *potius* is not added; that is, construction (a) is even in this case sometimes distinguished from (b). Cf. Plaut. Asin. 121 f., Aul. 653 f.; Caes. VII 17, 7, etc. The examples cited by C. F. W. Müller from Cicero (Verr. II 4, 39; 2, 91) seem doubtful; that is, the *infin.* should probably be read.

IV. One example is found of a *participle* connected by *potius quam* with the subjunc., the sense and construction being (a): Liv. XXXIII 13, 3.

V. 1. Instead of *potius quam*, sometimes the following are used in the same sense and with the same construction: *quam* alone, *prius quam*, *citius quam*, but probably never *ante quam*. All the examples of *citius quam* have the *fut.* in the leading clause.

2. The use of *potius* (*citius*, perhaps *prius*) *quam* with *ut* may have grown illogically out of such formulae as Cic. P. Planc. 8, tantum afuturam esse orationem meam a minima suspicione offensionis tuae, te *ut* potius obiurgem, quam *ut*, etc., where the second *ut* is a repetition of the first one. Very difficult to explain is Cic. Phil. 2, 25, citius dixerim iactasse se aliquos, ut fuisset in ea societate viderentur . . . quam *ut* quisquam celari vellet qui fuisset. Still, it furnishes a connecting link between the logical and the illogical *potius quam ut*.

[It will be observed that those examples in which the author considers the use of the indicative after *potius quam* illogical (see II above), do not belong exactly to either category; that is, they do not show that one expression is

more exact than another, nor do they imply conscious *avoidance* of an alternative on the part of the actor; but the *narrator* merely declares that one thing occurred instead of another's occurring, whereas, according to his view, the second would have been more appropriate or natural. (a) "The army fled rather than retreated" = "The withdrawal of the army was flight rather than a retreat," would *require* the indicative. (b) "The army allowed itself to be destroyed rather than retreat," would *require* the subjunctive. (c) "Why did he let Catiline go rather than arrest him" (= "instead of arresting him") differs from both the above; and the indicative does not seem illogical, although the subjunctive is the rule. So in the English we may doubt whether 'arrest' depends directly upon 'rather than' or is affected by 'did'; that is, we might either say "I wonder why he let C. escape rather than *arrested* him" (not usual, but intelligible), or "rather than *arrest* him": *cur emisit potius quam comprehenderit* or *comprehenderet*. The latter suggests a conscious choice of the actor between the two courses he might have pursued, and with *cur* this is more natural. But in (a) above we have exclusively the narrator's view, and in (b) exclusively the conscious choice of the actor between two alternatives. M. W. H.]

11. Pp. 60-73. Critical notes, by Paul Tannery, on the treatise of Joannes Alexandrinus (Philoponus) on the astrolabe. This interesting article contains a very important contribution to the history of astronomy (especially of astronomical instruments), besides many emendations of the text of Philoponus.

12. Pp. 73-80. E. Chatelain publishes numerous conjectures found written on the margin of a copy of Quintius Curtius by L. Quicherat.

13. P. 80. L. Havet emends Plaut. Aul. 250, Impero auctor <tibi> sum, etc.

14. Pp. 81-86. Biographical sketch of Louis-Eugène Benoist, by E. Chatelain. Benoist was born at Nangis (Seine-et-Marne) Nov. 28, 1831, and died at Paris May 22, 1887. After a short sojourn at the college of Fontainebleau, he studied at the *Institution Jauffret* and the *Collège Royal* (1842), entered the *École Normale* (1852), and was made professor (1855) at the *Lycée* of Marseilles. In 1862 he was made *Docteur ès Lettres*. His earlier studies were directed chiefly to historical subjects; but his habit of thoroughly studying the sources led him into philology, to which he finally devoted his labors. His edition of Vergil, of which the first volume appeared in 1867, created an epoch in the history of philology in France. He held positions successively at Nancy and Aix, and in the Sorbonne; and finally was elected a member of the Academy of Inscriptions. He published many works, chiefly editions of Latin authors, or critical articles on parts of Latin works. He was never willing to publish a work on any subject without first examining all that had been written on that subject; and he exercised a wholesome influence on students, by inspiring them with a spirit of thoroughness and method. A list of his works occupies three pages of the *Revue de Phil.* The most of them are on Plautus, Terence, Lucretius, Vergil, Horace, Catullus, Caesar, Livy; some are on educational subjects; and among them are a Latin-French and a French-Latin dictionary for students.

15. Pp. 87-96. Book Notices. (1). Virgilii Maronis grammatici Opera, edidit Johannes Huemer, 1886; M. Hertz, De Virgilii Maronis grammatici

epitomarum codice Ambianensi Disputatio, 1888; and E. Ernault, De Virgilio Marone grammatico Tolosano, 1886: all reviewed in a body by Paul Lejay, who gives a brief *précis* of each work. (2). Ch. S. notices favorably Lautensach, Verbalflexion der attischen Inschriften, 1887, and gives a list of the most important facts presented in the work. (3). A. K. mentions favorably Ad. Bauer, Thukydides und H. Müller-Strübing, 1887. (4). E. C. highly commends C. Sallusti Crispi, Jugurtha, Historiarum reliquiae codicibus servatae: Henricus Jordan tertium recensuit. (5). Favorable mention, by E. C., of C. Sallusti Crispi Bellum Jugurthinum: Scholarum in usum recognovit Robertus Novak, 1888. (6). E. C. briefly describes P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon XIII-XIV (edited by Charles Simmons). (7). E. C. commends Cornelii Taciti Opera (Dialogue des Orateurs), par Henri Goelzer. (8). E. C. briefly describes A. Ed. Chaignet, Essais de métrique grecque: Le vers iambique. (9). Contents of Paléographie des classiques latins, par E. Chatelain. 6e livraison: Horace, 1888.

No. 2.

1. Pp. 97-105. O. Riemann justifies the emendations (some thirty) that he introduced into the text of his edition of Livy, XXVII-XXX.

2. P. 105. Note by A. Gasc-Desfossés on the use of *quisque* in Cicero's Orations.

3. Pp. 106-12. Critical discussion of a few passages in Plaut. Aulularia, by Louis Havet.

4. P. 112. In Sal., Frag. Orléans, 9, 14, Max Bonnet proposes 'remissione.'

5. Pp. 113-17. Jules Nicole publishes a few small fragments of Hesiod, found among some Aegyptian papyri. They fall between 'Ερῶν 111 and 221, and are not without value.

6. P. 117. O. R. considers *esse* an *imperf.* in Cic. Pro. Arch. 8.

7. Pp. 118-27. J. Loth describes a new MS of Seneca De Remediis Fortuitorum, which he discovered at Quimper, and publishes a complete text, with critical apparatus.

8. P. 127. O. R. calls attention to the use of a doubly subordinate clause with a seemingly dependent *final* or *consecutive* subjunctive, as if *ut* had been used; as Cic. De Orat. I 167, petebat . . . quod cum impetrasset causa *caderet*, where *caderet* is not grammatically connected with either the relative or the leading clause.

9. P. 128. Notes by O. R. on Plat. Phaed. 63 *d* and 118 *a*.

10. Pp. 129-34. George Doncieux discusses the question who the Lygdamus of [Tibullus] Book III was. He shows that it could not have been any of the persons heretofore proposed: Tibullus himself, Ovid, Cassius of Parma, Valgius Rufus, Lucius Messalinus; and argues ingeniously that it was Lucius, the brother of Ovid.

11. P. 134. In Senec. (ad Lucilium) 88, 17, Max Bonnet suggests *detraho* for *desperabo*.

12. P. 135. O. R. shows that the troublesome *first* entrance into the *φροντιστήριον* (Ar. Nub. 184) was merely into the yard. He seems not to have seen Zieliński's similar explanation.

13. P. 136. F. Strowski defends *sed* = *nunc vero* by referring to Cic. De Off. III 3, 12, and O. R. adds Ad Q. Fr. I 1, 44.

14. Pp. 136-37. O. R. shows that not only the abl. (as Madvig states), but also the locative, is used of the place from which a letter is written. If the noun is not the name of a town, we find *de*, *ex*, *ab*, and once *in* (Cic. Ad Att. 16, 10).

15. Pp. 137-38. Max Bonnet shows that in Senec. Phoen. 363 ff., *ultra* should not be changed to *ultrō*, as has been done by recent editors.

16. Pp. 138-44. Book Notices. (1). F. de S. finds great merits and a few small faults in the Principles of Sound and Inflexion as illustrated in the Greek and Latin Languages, by J. E. King and C. Cookson, Oxford, 1888. (2). Albert Martin describes the third edition of Böckh's Staatshaushaltung der Athener. He commends the reviser for abstaining as much as possible from making alterations in the great original, but finds the plan adopted inconvenient, especially as the additions to both volumes are all printed in the second volume. (3). Albert Martin finds J. M. Hoogvliet's Studia Homerica (1885) an ingenious work in some respects, but lacking in critical method. (4). A. M. D. finds great faults and some merits in the first volume (Antigone) of Semitelos' edition of Sophocles. (5). According to A. M. D., in the Oedipus Tyrannus of J. Holub, "l'ignorance le dispute au mauvais goût." (6). A. M. D. commends F. W. Schmidt's Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern (1888), but points out slight faults. (7). Albert Martin describes and praises S. Lederer, Eine neue Handschrift von Arrian's Anabasis. (8). Albert Martin pronounces the dissertation of Wendland, De Musonio Stoico, interesting and instructive. (9). E. C. describes and commends L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libros XII ad codicem praecipue Ambrosianum recensuit M. C. Gertz, 1886. (10). E. C. briefly describes Gundermann's Juli Frontini Strategematon libri quattuor, 1888. (11). A. M. D. praises La Bibliothèque de Fulvio, par Pierre de Nolhac, 1887.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 145-72. An interesting article by Louis Havet on the punishment of Phlegyas in Verg. Aen. VI, in which it is shown that vv. 616-20 belong between 601 and 602, and the latter should begin *Quo super*.

2. P. 172. Some examples of *et non* = *nec* cited by A. Meillet.

3. Pp. 173-75. An interesting note by Henri Weil on the fragments of Hesiod published by Nicole (No. 2, pp. 113-17).

4. P. 175. Note on Arist. Eth. Nicom. I 2 (p. 1365 A 33), by Ruelle.

5. Pp. 176-85. Remarks on some questions of Latin syntax, by O. Riemann.

I. *Unus* with the genitive in Cicero. The old rule was that *unus* is construed with the gen. only when it is contrasted with *alter* (*alius*), *tertius*, etc. Some grammarians have set up a new rule, that *unus* is construed with the gen. only

when the *sum total* of the objects has been indicated in what precedes. Riemann examines the usage of Cicero, and finds that both rules are at fault, and that *unus* is construed with the gen. of the rel. or demons. pron., representing a group of objects that have just been mentioned. The usage of other authors (Caesar, Livy, Vergil), however, differs from that of Cicero.

II. *Toto orbe terrarum* or *in toto orbe terrarum*. The author examines a distinction suggested by Émile Thomas—that *tota Sicilia* means *throughout all Sicily*, while *in tota Sicilia* means *within the limits of all Sicily*. He finds that the idea of *throughout* is nearly always expressed by the simple abl. in Cicero, and virtually always in Caesar, Nepos and Livy; while the idea of *within the limits* is expressed in either way in Cicero and Livy, no examples being found in Caesar or Nepos. In some instances the use of *in* with the abl. would be impossible, the sense being not *ubi*, but *qua*, as in 'sparserunt se toto passim campo' (= *per totum campum*). When *in* is not used, *totus* is almost always placed *before* its noun.

6. Pp. 185–86. F. Picavet explains an inscription that is important for the history of Pyrrhonism.

7. Pp. 187–89. Critical notes on Plaut. Aul. 720 ff., 808 ff., by Louis Havet.

8. Book Notices. (1). E. C. describes Vol. II of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. (2). A. J. describes Van Leeuwen and Da Costa's *Homeri Iliadis carmina cum apparatu critico*, 1887, and considers it indispensable for critics of Homer, though not free from faults. (3). A. J. describes von Essen's *Index Thucydideus*, 1887, and (4) Heikel's *De praeparationis Euangelicae Eusebii edendae ratione*, 1888, and (5) Niese's *Flavii Iosephi opera*. (6). E. C. describes the third volume of *Die Handschriften der herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel*, by Otto von Heinemann.

No. 4.

This number merely finishes the *Revue des Revues*, partly published in previous numbers.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.